

REMARKS

The Examiner required restriction of one of the following inventions:

- I. Claims 1-3, drawn to a heater;
- II. Claim 4, drawn to a heating element; and
- III. Claim 5, drawn to a blower.

In response to the Examiner's restriction/election requirement, the Applicants elect, with traverse, to prosecute Group I including claims 1-3. The Applicants specifically reserve the right to file a divisional application directed to non elected claims.

Initially, the Applicants note that unity of invention rules apply where the application is a national stage application submitted under 35 U.S.C. § 371 (see MPEP § 1893.03(d)). Accordingly, the Applicants submit that unity of invention rules apply to the instant application.

As explained in MPEP § 1893.03(d): "A group of inventions is considered linked to form a single general inventive concept where there is a technical relationship among the inventions that involves at least one common or corresponding special technical feature." Accordingly, if there is a technical relationship among the claims that involves at least one common or corresponding special technical feature, then the claims share a single general inventive concept and therefore have unity of invention.

The Applicants submit the instant restriction requirement is improper at least because the claims have unity of invention. The claims share a general inventive concept relating to replacing heating elements in a heater in a time efficient and inexpensive way. The claims recite an embodiment of a heater which may be quickly

and easily assembled during the production of the heater. Furthermore, the claimed heating element may be quickly and easily replaced since the heating element may be easily detached from the blower fan, and replaced by a new heating element. The technical features shared among the claims relate to a snap lock member on the heating element/blower fan, which is designed to be positively engaged with another snap lock member on the blower fan/heating element, and in particular, wherein a snap lock member is made of a resilient material as defined in claims 1, 4, and 5. Accordingly, the Applicants submit claims 1-5 are linked to form a single general inventive concept because there is a technical relationship among the claims that involves at least one common or corresponding technical feature. Because claims 1-5 are linked to form a single general inventive concept and because there is a technical relationship among the claims that involves at least one common or corresponding technical feature, the Applicants submit the claims have unity of invention. Because the claims have unity of invention, the Applicants submit the instant restriction requirement is improper.

For all of the above stated reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding restriction/election requirement and favorable allowance of all claims in the instant application are earnestly solicited.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for a three (3) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$1,100 extension fee herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC

By


John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000

Rev. 35, 4/16

JAC/DMB/ame
enb